



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,862	02/16/2001	Rocky Stewart	BEAS-01033US6 SRM/KFK	6339
23910	7590	03/04/2005	EXAMINER LIN, WEN TAI	
FLIESLER MEYER, LLP FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,862

Applicant(s)

STEWART ET AL.

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-11 and 14-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-11 and 14-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/25/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4-11 and 14-26 are presented for examination.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.
3. Claims 1, 4-11 and 14-26 are objected to because the following terms lack antecedent basis:
 - (i) in claims 1 and 11, "the workflow process information";
 - (ii) in claims 1, 21 and 23, "the combined participant workflows"; and
 - (iii) in claims 9 and 10, "said integration mechanism".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 1, 5-11 and 15-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chaar et al.[U.S. Pat. No. 5960404].
5. As to claim 1, Chaar teaches the invention as claimed including: a workflow integration system for a collaboration system that allows for sharing of workflow

Art Unit: 2154

information among a plurality of collaboration participants [claim 21; e.g., sharing the same work list among multiple participants], comprising:

a plurality of collaboration participants [e.g., 110, 120, Fig.16];

a workflow server on each collaboration participant [e.g., 630 or 765 of Fig.12] stored thereon a participant workflow [e.g., 620, 1220, Fig.12], wherein said participant workflow specifies the workflow process information for a project local to that collaboration participant [col.12, lines 32 – 54; wherein 230 of Fig.1 represents local project to each of the participant workflow server (source) 100; on the other hand, the project associated with a performer is the list of tasks];

a collaboration server [1610, Fig.16; col.14, lines 59-67; i.e., the role manager is a collaboration server] having stored thereon and managing an enterprise workflow [i.e., the management task process performed by the role manager] that includes process information for the combined participant workflows [Fig.13; col.12, line 56 – col.13, line 13; i.e., as a participant performer under the role manager of Fig.16, workflow server 765 of Fig.13 obtains all the necessary process information (e.g., the workflow script template 1320 and input information required to execute it) for the combined participant workflows – in this case the parent workflow contains the subworkflow that is to be executed at workflow 765 server]; and

an integration logic [e.g., composition and late-binding] that allows one of said participant workflows to interact with another participant workflow via the enterprise workflow of the collaboration server, to affect the local projects running thereon [col.3, lines 57 – 65; col.15, lines 1-12].

6. As to claim 5, Chaar further teaches that the enterprise workflow includes at least one process flow lane for each active collaboration participant, and the action of the enterprise workflow is determined by messages sent to and received from each of said active collaboration participants [col.15, lines 1-12].

7. As to claim 6, Chaar further teaches that the enterprise workflow sends and receives messages directly from the participant [col.3, lines 54-56]

8. As to claim 7, Chaar further teaches that the enterprise workflow sends and receives messages from the participant workflow [col.4, lines 3-7].

9. As to claim 8, Chaar further teaches that the enterprise workflow sends and receives messages from the participant workflow via a collaboration enabler authorized to communicate with the collaboration server [130, 110, Fig.16].

10. As to claim 9, Chaar: Chaar further teaches that said integration mechanism allows the enterprise workflow to modify an active participant workflow process [col.19, lines 13 - 32].

Art Unit: 2154

11. As to claims 10-11 and 15-21, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1 and 5-9, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 5-9 above.

12. As to claim 22, Chaar further teaches that a participant workflow communicates with a plurality of other participant workflows via the collaboration server [e.g., col.15, lines 1-12].

13. As to claim 25, Chaar further teaches that the enterprise workflow and the participant workflows are active before interacting with each other [i.e., in a peer-to-peer communication mode both party must be active].

14. As to claims 23-24 and 26, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1, 21-22 and 25, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1, 21-22 and 25 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaar et al.(hereafter "Chaar")[U.S. Pat. No. 5960404], as applied to claims 1, 5-11 and 15-26 above.

Art Unit: 2154

16. As to claims 4 and 14, Chaar does not specifically teach the enterprise workflow is stored in the collaborative server and that the enterprise workflow and the participant workflow may interact through exchange of XML data.

However, Chaar et al. taught that a special-purpose performer takes the role of collaborating work distribution among a plurality of task performers, wherein each performer is also a workflow server containing a workflow template repository [e.g., 1230, Fig. 12, or 1310, Fig. 13A]. It is obvious that, in order to keeping track of all the participants' statuses, the collaborative server must have a workflow repository containing copies of the enterprise and participant workflow.

Further, Chaar et al. taught that the task request and response could be transferred as mailed messages using Internet protocol [col.22, lines 9-16]. Thus it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that XML or HTML are obvious document formats for the exchange of workflow information.

17. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/14/2004 for claims 1, 4-11 and 14-20 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

18. Applicant argues in the remarks that:

1. Chaar's the workflow on the remote server appears to be not local to the project on the remote server, but is rather a part of the project on the parent workflow server.

2. Chaar's workflow system does not include an enterprise workflow that includes process information for the combined participant workflows, nor does Chaar's source workflow interact with a performer workflow via an enterprise workflow.
19. Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's remarks:
1. As to point 1: it is noted that since the word "project" has not been precisely defined in the claim or in the specification, the "project" has been broadly interpreted as a task or activity. Under such interpretation, the "project" local to the performer (or the remote server, which is another participant) is exactly the task to be performed thereon.
 2. As to point 2: it is noted that since the phrase "enterprise workflow" has not been precisely defined in the claim or in the specification, the phrase has been broadly interpreted as the management tasks performed by the collaboration server (i.e., the role manager).
20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2154

21. 25. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action:

Conclusion

Examiner note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the contest of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(571)273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

February 24, 2005

Wen-Tai Lin
2/24/05